

Please amend the application as follows:

In the Claims

Please add new Claims 18 and 19.

- C1
18. (New) The method of Claim 5, wherein from about 0.01 M to about 0.05 M iodine is present in the aqueous solvent mixture.
19. (New) The method of Claim 18, wherein from about 0.02 M to about 0.05 M iodine is present in the aqueous solvent mixture.

REMARKS

Claim Amendments

Claims 18 and 19 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found at page 19, line 26 to page 20, line 10. No new matter has been added.

Telephonic Interview

Applicants' Attorney, Lisa M. Treannie, would like to thank the Examiner for granting a telephonic interview and for her helpful comments during the interview that was conducted December 3, 2002. The Examiner clarified the nature of the rejection and the type of evidence that would be required to overcome the rejection. The Examiner also stated that Claims 4, 15, 16 and 17 should have been indicated as allowable in the Advisory Action mailed October 29, 2002, because the recitation of 0.02 M iodine is fully supported by the example in the specification at pages 22 to 24.

Rejection of Claims 1-17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Earhart, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,137; Reference A) in view of McGall, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,147,205; Reference B). The Examiner states that it is unclear that unexpected results, in terms of improved functional performance of a nucleic acid array, would be observed with concentrations